

§ 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. Applicant now addresses each of these rejections in the order presented in the Office Action.

In Claim 8, line 6, the Examiner has noted that "said first and second banks" has no antecedent basis. As discussed further below, the limitations of Claim 8 are now incorporated into independent Claim 7. The term "said first and second banks" has been replaced with "said plurality of banks," the latter term having proper antecedent basis.

In Claim 14, lines 11, 12 and 17, the Examiner has noted that it is unclear if the term "sense amplifiers" are the same as "slave amplifiers." As discussed further below, Claim 14 has been placed in independent form. Applicant has further amended the claims to clarify that the "sense amplifiers" are in fact "slave sense amplifiers."

In Claim 22, lines 12 and in Claim 24, line 2, the Examiner has noted that the term "data" is not clear to the extent that such data is or is not the same data as in Claim 22, line 10. Applicant has amended Claim 2, where necessary, by inserting the term "the" to clarify that the claimed data is in fact the same data found in Claim 22.

In Claim 23, line 2, the Examiner has noted that it is unclear as to whether "other cells" describes the same cells as in Claim 22, line 13 or different cells. Applicant has

A

amended Claim 22 by replacing "other cells" with "different cells" to particularly point out that the cells to which the data are being transferred are different from the cells from which that data was originally read.

The disclosure also stands objected to because of informalities in Claims 9 and 11. Specifically, the Examiner has requested that the term "the" should be deleted in various instances therein. Applicant has made the corrections where appropriate.

II. The Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102 and 103

Claims 7-10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by *Iwase*. Claims 1-6 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by *Shikata*. Additionally, Claims 1-7, 9, 10 and 15-24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by *Kanabara*. Along with the rejections under Section 102, the Examiner has also rejected Claims 8, 10 and 12 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over the combination of *Kanabara* and *Shikata*. In view of the above amendments to the claims, Applicant respectfully traverses each of these rejections.

As a starting point, the Examiner has noted that Claims 13 and 14 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112 and to include all of the limitations of the base claims and intervening claims. The Examiner has noted that the prior art does not disclose

reading a section of a cell array selected by row decoder into slave sense amps through the master sense amps and shifting and writing the same data into another section of the array by the decoder through the master sense amplifier. Applicant has amended independent Claim 7 to include all the limitations of Claim 13 and intervening Claim 8. Claim 7, and remaining dependent Claims 9-12 should now be allowable. In regards to Claim 14, Applicant has amended Claim 14 to include all the limitations found in former base Claim 7 and former intervening Claim 8. Claim 14 should now be allowable.

Claim 1, and independent Claims 2-6 dependent thereon, have been amended to include limitations directed to a memory which includes control circuitry which controls the sensing of data from cells in a first row (section) of the array, the temporary storage of that data in associated slave circuitry, and the rewriting of that data back into another row (section) in the array selected by the addressing circuitry. For reasons similar to those set forth by the Examiner with regards to Claims 13 and 14, Applicant respectfully believes that Claims 1-6 are now allowable.

Claim 15 has been amended to also particularly point out and distinctly claim circuitry for implementing a block move by sensing data from a first section in memory (in this case a first row), transferring that data to a first slave sense amplifier bank, and then writing that data back into another section in the array (i.e., another row). Claim 15 further

includes the limitation of providing multiple moves by alternating the temporary storage function between a pair of slave sense amplifier banks. Claim 15, and Claims 16-18 dependent thereon, should be allowable for reasons similar to those set forth above.

Claim 22 and Claims 23-24 are method claims directed to the movement of data from one section in the array to another section in the array. As amended, data is retrieved from the array by the master sense amplifiers, latched into a bank of slave amplifiers, and then written back into other cells in the array. In the specific embodiments of Claims 23 and 24, the data is either shifted within the slave sense amplifier bank and then read back into different cells along the same row or written to another entirely different row in the array.

As the Examiner has correctly noted, the prior art does not show the reading of a section of a cell array into slave sense amplifiers and the subsequent writing of that data back to another section in the array. Applicant therefore respectfully traverses the rejections of Claims 22-24.

For the foregoing reasons, Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections of the claims. If the Examiner has any questions or comments concerning this Amendment or the present application in general, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned at 214-745-5374.

13

Respectfully submitted,

WINSTEAD SECHREST & MINICK P.C.
Attorneys for Applicant

By: James J. Murphy
James J. Murphy
Reg. No. 34,503

5400 Renaissance Tower
1201 Elm Street
Dallas, Texas 75270
(214) 745-5374

Attorney's Docket:

2836-P007US

Date: 7-24-95

DA951940171/wpwin
072095tlml
233:2836-P007US

I hereby certify that this correspondence is
being deposited with the United States Postal
Service as first class mail in an envelope
addressed to: Commissioner of Patents and
Trademarks, Washington, D.C. 20231 on

July 24, 1995

Signature Terri Massengale

Name TERRI MASSENGALE

7-24-95 Date of Signature